MIGINAL



BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION CORPORATION RECEIVED 1 <u>COMMISSIONERS</u> DOUG LITTLE- Chairman 2 2016 APR - 1 A 9 10 **BOB STUMP** 3 **BOB BURNS** AZ CORP COMMISSION TOM FORESE DOCKET CONTROL ANDY TOBIN 5 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF DOCKET NO. W-03718A-15-0213 SAHUARITA WATER COMPANY, LLC, FOR A DETERMINATION OF THE CURRENT STAFF'S NOTICE OF FILING FAIR VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PROPERTY SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY AND FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF JUST AND REASONABLE RATES AND 8 CHARGES. 9 10 Staff of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Staff") hereby files the Surrebuttal Testimony 11 of Staff Witnesses Teresa B. Hunsaker, Michael S. Thompson and Crystal S. Brown in the above 12 docket. 13 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 1st day of April 2016. 14 15 Brian E. Smith, Attorney Matthew Laudone, Attorney 16 Legal Division Arizona Corporation Commission 17 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007 18 (602) 542-3402 Original and thirteen (13) copies 19 of the foregoing filed this 1st day of April 2016 with: 20 Docket Control 21 Arizona Corporation Commission **Arizona Corporation Commission** 1200 West Washington Street DOCKETED Phoenix, Arizona 85007 APR 0 1 2016 23 Copy of the foregoing emailed/mailed this 1st day of April 2016 to: 24 DOCKETED BY

28

25

26

27

Jason D. Gellman

Snell & Wilmer, LLP One Arizona Center

Phoenix, Arizona 85004

jgelllman@swlaw.com

400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 1900

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

DOUG LITTLE	
Chairman BOB STUMP	
Commissioner	
BOB BURNS	
Commissioner	
TOM FORESE	
Commissioner	
ANDY TOBIN	
Commissioner	
DIENE MARKED OF THE ADDITION OF A	DOCUMENTO WILLIAM AT COM
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF	DOCKET NO. W-03718A-15-0213
SAHUARITA WATER COMPANY, LLC, FOR A	
DETERMINATION OF THE CURRENT FAIR	
VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PROPERTY AND)
FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF JUST AND	
REASONABLE RATES AND CHARGES.	
)

SURREBUTTAL

TESTIMONY

OF

TERESA B. HUNSAKER

PUBLIC UTILITIES ANALYST

UTILITIES DIVISION

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

P	age
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PURPOSE OF SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY	1
III. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED REVENUES	2
IV. RATE BASE	2
Plant in Service ("PIS") Accumulated Depreciation ("A/D") Contributions in Aid of Construction ("CIAC") Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes ("ADIT")	5
V. OPERATING INCOME	
Depreciation Expense	6 6 8
VI. RATE DESIGN	8

SURREBUTTAL SCHEDULES

Revenue Requirement	TBH-1
Gross Revenue Conversion Factor	ТВН-2
Rate Base - Original Cost/Fair Value	TBH-3
Summary of Original Cost Rate Base Adjustments	ТВН-4
Rate Base Adjustment No. 1 – Plant Reclassification	ТВН-5
Rate Base Adjustment No. 2 – Plant Retirement	ТВН-6
Rate Base Adjustment No. 3 – Post-Test Year Plant	ТВН-7
Rate Base Adjustment No. 4 – Accumulated Depreciation	ТВН-8
Rate Base Adjustment No. 5a - Contribution in Aid of Construction	TBH-9a
Rate Base Adjustment No. 5b – Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes	TBH-9b
Operating Income Statement - Adjusted Test Year and Staff Recommended	TBH-10
Summary of Operating Income Statement Adjustments – Test Year	TBH-11
Operating Income Adj. No. 1 – Expense Reclassifications	TBH-12
Operating Income Adj. No. 2 – Contractual Service – Other Expense	TBH-13
Operating Income Adj. No. 3 – Management Fees Expense	ТВН-14
Operating Income Adj. No. 4 – Water Testing Expense	TBH-15
Operating Income Adj. No. 5 – Rate Case Expense	ТВН-16
Operating Income Adj. No. 6 – Not Used	TBH-17
Operating Income Adj. No. 7 – Depreciation Expense	ТВН-18
Operating Income Adj. No. 8 – Property Tax Expense	TBH-19
Operating Income Adj. No. 9 – Income Tax Expense	TBH-20
Rate Design	TBH-21
Typical Bill Analysis	TBH-22
<u>ATTACHMENTS</u>	

Company's Response to DR TBH 1.34 Attachment A

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY SAHUARITA WATER COMPANY, LLC DOCKET NO. W-03718A-15-0213

Staff's surrebuttal testimony recommends rates that would increase operating revenues by \$166,419 to produce operating revenues of \$3,063,165 resulting in operating income of \$122,456 or a 5.75 percent increase over test year revenues of \$2,896,746. Staff also recommends a revised original cost rate base ("OCRB") of \$9,359,714. Staff's recommend rate of return is 8.41 percent.

Staff's direct testimony recommended rates that would increase operating revenues by \$70,562 to produce operating revenues of \$2,967,308.

Typical Bill Analysis

The typical 5/8 x 3/4-inch meter residential customers with a median usage of 4,500 gallons would experience a \$2.18 or a 7.18 percent increase in their monthly bill, from \$30.28 to \$32.45, under Staff's surrebuttal recommended rates.

I. INTRODUCTION

- Q. Please state your name, occupation, and business address.
- A. My name is Teresa B. Hunsaker. I am a Public Utilities Analyst III employed by the Arizona Corporation Commission ("ACC" or "Commission") in the Utilities Division ("Staff"). My business address is 1200 West Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85007.
- Q. Are you the same Teresa B. Hunsaker who filed direct testimony in this case?
- A. Yes, I am.

II. PURPOSE OF SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

- Q. What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony in this proceeding?
- A. The purpose of my surrebuttal testimony in this proceeding is to respond, on behalf of Staff, to the rebuttal testimony of Sahuarita Water Company ("SWC" or "Company") witnesses Mr. Geoff Caron and Mr. Thomas J. Bourassa regarding revenue requirement, rate base, and operating revenues and expenses.
- Q. Did you attempt to address every issue raised by the Company in its rebuttal testimony?
- A. No. I limited my discussion to certain issues as outlined below. My silence on any particular issue raised in the Company's rebuttal testimony does not indicate that I agree with the Company's stated rebuttal position on the issue. Rather, where I do not respond, I rely on my direct testimony.

III. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED REVENUES

- Q. Has Staff reviewed Mr. Bourassa's rebuttal testimony regarding revenue requirement for the Company?
- A. Yes.

- Q. Please summarize the proposed and recommended revenue requirement, revenue increases, and percentage increase.
- A. The proposed and recommended revenue requirement, revenue increase, and percentage increase are as follows:

	Revenue Requirement	Revenue Increase	% Increase
Company - Direct	\$3,229,480	\$332,733	11.49%
Staff - Direct	\$2,967,308	\$70,562	2.44%
Company – Rebuttal	\$3,173,385	\$276,638	9.55%
Staff - Surrebuttal	\$3,063,165	\$166.419	5.75%

- Q. What are the primary reasons why the Company's revenue requirement is higher and proposed increase larger than Staff's recommendation?
- A. The difference in revenue requirement is primarily a result of the differences in plant in service, cost of capital, and operating expenses.

IV. RATE BASE

- Q. Has Staff reviewed Mr. Bourassa's rebuttal testimony regarding rate base for the Company?
- A. Yes. The Company's filing treats the original cost rate base ("OCRB") the same as the fair value rate base ("FVRB").

1 2 Q. Would Staff please identify the respective rate base proposed by the Company and recommended by Staff?

3

Yes, the rate bases proposed by the Company and recommended by Staff are as follows: A.

4

	<u>OCRB/FVRB</u>
Company - Direct	\$9,298,032
Staff - Direct	\$8,778,456
Company - Rebuttal	\$9,359,714
Staff - Surrebuttal	\$9,359,714

5

6

7

Q. What changes did Staff make to Rate Base in surrebuttal testimony?

A. Staff made changes to the following adjustments:

8

9

1. Rate Base Adjustment No. 1 – Plant Reclassifications

10

2. Rate Base Adjustment No. 2 - Plant Additions and Retirements

11 12 3. Rate Base Adjustment No. 4 - Accumulated Depreciation ("A/D")

13

4. Rate Base Adjustment No. 5a - Contributions in Aid of Construction ("CIAC") and Accumulated Amortization

14

5. Rate Base Adjustment No. 5b – Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes ("ADIT")

15 16

Q. Will Staff please discuss the Company's proposed OCRB?

18

17

A. Yes. Staff worked directly with the Company after Staff's direct testimony was filed to correct the Company's proposed OCRB. The Company has detailed these changes in its

19

rebuttal testimony by both of the Company's witnesses. Based on these discussions and

20

responses by the Company to Staff's data requests, Staff and the Company were able to resolve the issues in the OCRB. Staff will address the rebuttal rate base adjustments to

OCRB to Plant in Service ("PIS"), Accumulated Depreciation ("A/D"), Contribution in Aid

21 22

		buttal Testimony of Teresa B. Hunsaker et No. W-03718A-15-0213 4
1		of Construction ("CIAC") and Accumulated Amortization, and Accumulated Deferred
2		Income Taxes ("ADIT").
3		
4	Plant	in Service ("PIS")
5	Q.	Does Staff concur with the Company's proposed PIS adjustments in the Company's
6		rebuttal testimony?
7	A.	Yes. Staff worked directly with the Company to properly reflect the following as shown in
8		Staff's Adjustments No. 1 and No. 2:
9		
10		1. Reverse the retirements for arsenic media;
11		2. Reclassification of the arsenic media costs and water treatment equipment;
12		3. Reclassification of the original arsenic media costs; and,
13		4. Retirement of original arsenic media.
14		
15	Q.	Does Staff concur with the Company's proposed rebuttal treatment of the
16		reclassification of the original arsenic media costs to a separate plant account?
17	Α.	Yes. Staff concurs with the Company that the useful life for the original arsenic media costs
18		is approximately 15 years.
19		
20	Q.	Does Staff concur with the Company's reclassification of the Water Treatment
21		Equipment?
22	A.	Yes. Staff concurs with the Company's reversal of the \$120,000 retirement of arsenic media
23		costs as shown in Staff's Adjustment No. 2.
24		

		buttal Testimony of Teresa B. Hunsaker set No. W-03718A-15-0213 5
1	Accun	nulated Depreciation ("A/D")
2	Q.	Does Staff concur with the Company's proposed A/D adjustments in the Company's
3		rebuttal testimony?
4	A.	Yes. Staff concurs with the Company's proposed A/D adjustments. Due to the proposed
5	i.	adjustments to PIS, the proposed A/D adjustments are appropriate as reflected in the plant
6		reconstruction provided by the Company as shown in Staff's Adjustment No. 4.
7		
8	Contr	ibutions in Aid of Construction ("CIAC")
9	Q.	Does Staff concur with the Company's proposed adjustments to CIAC and/or
10		Accumulated Amortization?
11	A.	Yes. Staff concurs with the Company's proposed CIAC adjustments to the accumulated
12		amortization as shown in Staff's Adjustment No. 5a.
13		
14	Accun	nulated Deferred Income Taxes ("ADIT")
15	Q.	Does Staff concur with the Company's proposed adjustments to ADIT?
16	A.	Yes. Staff concurs with the Company's proposed adjustments to ADIT in Staff's Adjustment
17		No. 5b.
18		
19	v. o	PERATING INCOME
20	Q.	What changes did Staff make to Operating Income in its surrebuttal testimony?
21	A.	Staff made changes to the following adjustments:
22		
23		1. Operating Income Adjustment No. 7 – Depreciation Expense
24		2. Operating Income Adjustment No. 9 – Income Tax Expense
25		

7 8

6

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- Q. Has Staff reviewed Mr. Bourassa's rebuttal testimony regarding revenue and expenses for the Company?
- A. Yes.
- Does Staff concur with all of the Company's expense adjustments in the Company's Q. rebuttal testimony?
- A. No. Staff's depreciation expense is only different due to rounding, and Staff will address the Company's rebuttal testimony regarding incentive pay bonuses to contract employees.

Depreciation Expense

- Please describe the total difference in Staff's depreciation expense to the Company's Q. depreciation expense.
- Staff depreciated Original Arsenic Media Plant Account 320.4 at 6.67 percent as shown on A. Schedule TBH-18. Staff's total adjusted depreciation expense for the test year is \$22,028. The Company depreciated Original Arsenic Media - Plant Account 320.4 at 6.66 percent on Rebuttal Schedule C-2, Page 2. The Company's total adjusted depreciation expense for the test year is \$22,049. The total difference is \$21.

Contractual Services – Management Fees Expense

- Does Staff concur with the Company's proposed contractual services management Q. fees expense adjustment for bonuses in the Company's rebuttal testimony?
- No. Staff continues to disagree with the inclusion of incentive pay bonuses with payroll taxes A. for non-dedicated and dedicated employees of Rancho Sahuarita Management Company ("RSMC"). Staff removed all incentive pay bonuses for both non-dedicated and dedicated contract employees in the amount of \$21,470. RSMC has steadily increased the salaries of the contract employees over the years as their duties and responsibilities have changed. Through

numerous data requests provided by the Company, Staff reviewed the salary increases without bonuses over several years (Projected 2015, Test Year 2014 and 2013) and the increases varied from approximately 0.5 percent to approximately 18.0 percent. The national average in 2015 for pay increases has projected an increase of 3.0 percent.

Q. Did Staff review the distribution of the incentive pay bonuses to dedicated employees in 2014? Please explain.

A. Yes. Staff reviewed the distribution of incentive pay bonuses to non-dedicated and dedicated contract employees covered by RSMC. Approximately 66 percent of these bonuses were paid to seven dedicated contract employees (13 total employees) including one employee that is allocated at 89 percent to the Company directly. The dedicated employees in managerial or supervisory roles consisted of four employees that were provided with approximately 95 percent of these bonuses.

Q. Did Staff review the distribution of the incentive pay bonuses to non-dedicated employees in 2014? Please explain.

A. Yes. The four non-dedicated employees received approximately 38 percent of their entire bonuses from the Company and 62 percent from an affiliate Company. However, the Company has been allocated from 10 percent to 30 percent of their salary and benefits.

Q. Has Staff been provided with incentive plans or documentation to support that bonuses are part of the total compensation package?

A. No. In the Company's response to Data Request TBH 1.34b, the Company stated that "There is nothing in writing and it is entirely up to the Managing Partner. Items that are considered are overall performance and vehicle use. During the year, employees are not

1 2 reimbursed for the use of their private vehicles and this is also taken into consideration at the end of the year." Staff has provided a copy of this data request in Attachment A.

Staff continues to recommend that no incentive pay bonuses to dedicated or non-dedicated

contract employees be funded by rate payers. Staff recommends that all contract employees

be required to properly account for the use of their personal vehicles for business purposes

Yes. Staff inadvertently linked the wrong tax rates in direct testimony that created an error in

3

4

A.

Q. What is Staff's recommendation?

and be reimbursed by the Company.

56

7

8

9

10

Income Taxes Expense

and schedules.

11

Q. Did Staff make any corrections in its schedule to test year Income Tax Expense?

1213

Adjustment No. 9. Staff has properly linked the appropriate tax rates in surrebuttal testimony

Α.

14

15

Q. Did Staff make an adjustment to test year Income Tax Expense?

17

16

A. Yes. Staff applied the Company's income tax rates as provided on the Company's Schedule

18 19 C-3, Page 2 for this LLC to Staff's adjusted test year taxable income. Income tax expenses for the test year and recommended revenues are shown on Schedules TBH-11 and TBH-20.

20

21

VI. RATE DESIGN

22

Q. What is Staff's recommended rate design for water service?

23

A. The Staff's recommended rates are shown on Surrebuttal Schedule TBH-21, pages 1 and 2.

24

Q. Did Staff review the recommended revenue requirement generated in direct testimony as discussed by the Company in its rebuttal testimony?

A. Yes. Staff reviewed the recommended revenue requirement through Staff's recommended rate design. Due to Staff's acceptance of the Company's usage normalization and revenue annualization, Staff adjusted the rate design in surrebuttal to take into consideration these adjustments to revenue.

Q. What is the rate impact on a typical 5/8 x 3/4-inch meter residential customer with median usage in Staff's recommended surrebuttal rates?

A. The typical 5/8 x 3/4-inch meter residential customers with a median usage of 4,500 gallons would experience a \$2.18 or a 7.18 percent increase in their monthly bill, from \$30.28 to \$32.45, under Staff's recommended rates. A typical bill analysis is provided on Schedule TBH-22.

Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?

A. Yes, it does.

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF TERESA B. HUNSAKER

TABLE OF CONTENTS TO SURREBUTTAL SCHEDULES TBH

<u>SCH #</u>	TITLE
TBH-1	REVENUE REQUIREMENT
TBH-2	GROSS REVENUE CONVERSION FACTOR
TBH-3	RATE BASE - ORIGINAL COST/FAIR VALUE
TBH-4	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL COST RATE BASE ADJUSTMENTS
TBH-5	RATE BASE ADJUSTMENT NO. 1 - Plant Reclassification
TBH-6	RATE BASE ADJUSTMENT NO. 2 - Plant Additions and Retirements
TBH-7	RATE BASE ADJUSTMENT NO. 3 - Post-Test Year Plant
TBH-8	RATE BASE ADJUSTMENT NO. 4 - Accumulated Depreciation
TBH-9a	RATE BASE ADJUSTMENT NO. 5a - Contributions in Aid of Construction ("CIAC") Amortization
TBH-9b	RATE BASE ADJUSTMENT NO. 5b - Accumlated Deferred Income Taxes ("ADIT")
TBH-10	OPERATING INCOME STATEMENT - ADJUSTED TEST YEAR AND STAFF RECOMMENDED
TBH-11	SUMMARY OF OPERATING INCOME STATEMENT ADJUSTMENTS - TEST YEAR
TBH-12	OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT NO. 1 - Expense Reclassifications
TBH-13	OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT NO. 2 - Contractual Services - Other Expense
TBH-14	OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT NO. 3 - Management Fees Expense
TBH-15	OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT NO. 4 - Water Testing Expense
TBH-16	OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT NO. 5 - Rate Case Expense
TBH-17	OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT NO. 6 - Not Used
TBH-18	OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT No. 7 - Depreciation Expense
TBH-19	OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT No. 8 - Property Taxes Expense
TBH-20	OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT NO. 9 - Income Tax Expense

SAHUARITA WATER COMPANY LLC

Surrebuttal Schedule TBH-1

Docket No. W-03718A-15-0213 Test Year December 31, 2014

REVENUE REQUIREMENT

		[A] COMPANY	[B]
LINE		ORIGINAL	STAFF ORIGINAL
NO.	DESCRIPTION	COST	COST
1	Adjusted Rate Base	\$9,298,032	\$9,359,714
2	Adjusted Operating Income (Loss)	\$598,003	\$664,683
3	Current Rate of Return (L2 / L1)	6.43%	7.10%
4	Required Rate of Return	9.20%	8.41%
5	Required Operating Income (I.4 * L1)	\$855,419	\$787,140
6	Operating Income Deficiency (L5 - L2)	\$257,416	\$122,456
7	Gross Revenue Conversion Factor	1.2926	1.3590
8	Required Revenue Increase (L7 * L6)	\$332,734	\$166,419
9	Adjusted Test Year Revenue	\$2,896,746	\$2,896,746
10	Proposed Annual Revenue (L8 + L9)	\$3,229,480	\$3,063,165
11	Required Increase in Revenue (%)	11.49%	5.75%

References:

Column [A]: Company Schedule B-1

Column [B]: Staff Schedules OCRB, GRCF, TYOI & COC

	GROSS REVENUE CONVERSION FACTOR						
Line		[A]	[B]	[C]	[D]	[E]	[F]
No.	<u>Description</u>						
	Calculation of Gross Revenue Conversion Factor.	100.0000%					
1 2	Revenue Uncollectible Factor (Line 11)	0.0000%					
3	Revenues (L1 - L2)	100.0000%					
4	Combined Federal and State Income Tax and Property Tax Rate (L23)	26.4168% 73.5832%					
5 6	Subtotal (L3 - L4) Revenue Conversion Factor (L1 / L5)	1.359005					
	Calculation of Uncollectible Factor:						
7	Unity	100.0000%					
8	Combined Federal and State Tax Rate (L17) One Minus Combined Income Tax Rate (L7 - L8)	25.0817% 74.9183%					
9 10	Uncollectible Rate	0.0000%					
11	Uncollectible Factor (L9 * L10)	-	0.0000%				
	Calculation of Effective Tax Rate:	400.00001/					
12	Operating Income Before Taxes (Arizona Taxable Income)	100.0000% 3.3693%					
13 14	Arizona State Income Tax Rate (L57 Col E) Federal Taxable Income (L12 - L13)	96.6307%					
15	Applicable Federal Income Tax Rate (L56 Col E)	22.4694%					
16	Effective Federal Income Tax Rate (L14 * L15)	21.7123%	25.0817%				
17	Combined Federal and State Income Tax Rate (L13 +L16)	-	23.001770				
10	<u>Calculation of Effective Property Tax Factor</u> Unity	100.0000%					
18 19	Combined Federal and State Income Tax Rate (L17)	25.0817%					
20	One Minus Combined Income Tax Rate (L18 - L19)	74.9183%					
21 22	Property Tax Factor Effective Property Tax Factor (L20 * L21)	1.7821%	1.3351%				
23	Combined Federal and State Income Tax and Property Tax Rate (L17 + L22)	-	1.000170	26.4168%			
	• •		-				
24	Required Operating Income (Schedule TBH-1, L5) Adjusted Test Year Operating Income (Loss) (Schedule TBH-10, L32)	\$ 787,140 \$ 664,683					
25 26	Required Increase in Operating Income (L24 - L25)	301,335	\$ 122,456				
		454,000					
27 28	Income Taxes on Recommended Revenue (Col. [F], L52) Income Taxes on Test Year Revenue (Col. [C], L52)	\$ 156,892 \$ 115,895					
29	Required Increase in Revenue to Provide for Income Taxes (L27 - L28)	*	\$ 40,997				
**	n 11n n 1 (01.11.TDII 114)	\$ 3,063,165					
30 31	Recommended Revenue Requirement (Schedule TBH-1, L10) Uncollectible Rate (L10)	0.0000%					
32	Uncollectible Expense on Recommended Revenue (L24 * L25)	\$0					
33	Adjusted Test Year Uncollectible Expense	\$0	\$0				
34	Required Increase in Revenue to Provide for Uncollectible Exp.		ą0				
35	Property Tax with Recommended Revenue (Schedule TBH-19, L19)	\$157,528					
36 37	Property Tax on Test Year Revenue (Schedule TBH-19, L20) Increase in Property Tax Due to Increase in Revenue (L35 - L36) (Schedule TBH-19, L2)	\$154,562	\$ 2,966				
31	increase in Property 12x Due to increase in revenue (200 - 200) (Schedule 1971 17, 200		* -,				
38	Total Required Increase in Revenue (L26 + L29 + L34 +L37)	\$ 166,419					
		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	E	F
		Test Yes	ar			Staff Recommend	
	Calculation of Income Tax:	Total \$2.806.746		Water \$2,906,746	Total		Water \$3,063,165
39 40	Revenue Operating Expenses Excluding Income Taxes	\$2,896,746 2,116,169		\$2,896,746 2,116,169	\$3,063,165 2,119,134		2,119,134
41		80,494		80,494	80,494		80,494
42	Arizona Taxable Income (L39 - L40 - L41)	\$ 700,084		\$ 700,084	\$ 863,537		\$ 863,537 2.8592%
43 44	Arizona State Effective Income Tax Rate (see Company Schedule C-3, Page 2) Arizona Income Tax (1.42 * 1.43)	\$ 2.7401% \$ 19,183		2.7401% \$ 19,183	2.8592% \$ 24,690		\$ 24,690
45	Federal Taxable Income (L42 - L44)	\$ 680,901		\$ 680,901	\$ 838,846		\$ 838,846
46	Federal Tax Rate (see Company Schedule C-3, Page 2)	14.2034%		14.2034%	15.7598%		15.7598%
47 48	Federal Tax	\$ 96,711		\$ 96,711	\$ 132,201		\$ 132,201
49							
50							
51 52							
52 53	Total Federal Income Tax	\$ 96,711		\$ 96,711	\$ 132,201		\$ 132,201
54	Combined Federal and State Income Tax (L35 + L42)	\$ 115,895		\$ 115,895	\$ 156,892		\$ 156,892
55	COMBINED Applicable Federal Income Tax Rate [Col. [D], L53 - Col. [A], L53] / [Col.	[D], L45 - Col. [A], L45]			22.4694%		
56	Applicable Federal Income Tax Rate [Col. [F], L53 - Col. [C], L53] / [Col. [F], L45 - Col.	[C], L45]				22.4694%	
57	Applicable State Income Tax Rate [Col. [F], L44 - Col. [C], L44] / [Col. [F], L42 - Col. [C]	.], 1.42]				3.3693%	'e
			197	Liver .	1		
	Calculation of Interest Synchronization:	1	Wastewater	Water	I		

58 Rate Base
59 Weighted Average Cost of Debt
60 Synchronized Interest (L59 * L60)

r.:::
Water
\$9,359,714
0.8600%
\$80,494

RATE BASE -	ORIGINIAL	COST	/EAID	WATTIE
TOTAL DINGLE -	OMOTIVE	COSI	A TATE	VALUE

		[A]	[B]		[C]
		COMPANY			STAFF
LINE		AS	STAFF		AS
NO.	DESCRIPTION	FILED	ADJUSTMENTS	REF	ADJUSTED
1	Plant in Service	\$27,468,728	(\$39,152)	1,2,3	\$27,429,576
2	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	6,309,380	(161,732)	4	6,147,648
3	Net Plant in Service	\$21,159,348	122,579		\$21,281,927
	LESS:			•	
	<u>1.1.33.</u>				
4	Net Contribution in Aid-of Construction (CIAC)	\$6,335,865	\$22, 097	5a	\$6,357,962
	,	, ,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	# 	J.	Ψ0,337,30Z
5	Advances in Aid of Construction (AIAC)	5,189,497	0		5,189,497
6	Customer Deposits	50.074			
U	Customer Deposits	52,876	0		52,876
7	Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes (ADIT)	283,077	38,801	5b	321,878
					,
	Total Deductions	\$11,861,315	\$60,898	-	\$11,922,213
	ADD:				
8	Unamortized Finance Charges	\$0	\$0		# O
-	- Innie Giange	40	\$ 0		\$0
9	Deferred Tax Assets	0	0		0
			Ü		Ŭ
10	Allowance for Working Capital	0	0		0
4.4	T				
11	Rounding	(1)	1		0
	Total Additions	(\$1)	\$1	-	\$0
	-	(#1)	φ1	-	<u> </u>
12	Original Cost Rate Base	\$9,298,032	61,682		\$9,359,714
				=	

References:

Column [A]: Company Schedule B-1

Column [B]: Schedule TBH-4

SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL COST RATE BASE ADJUSTMENTS \mathbb{B} [C] F [H] ACCT. LINE COMPANY Plant Reclass Plant Add and Retire Post-Test Year Accum. Dep CIAC ADIT STAFF NO. DESCRIPTION AS FILED ADJ No. 1 ADI No. 2 ADI No. 3 ADI No. 4 ADJ No. 5a ADJ No. 5b ADJUSTED Ref: Sch TBH-5 Ref: Sch TBH-6 Ref: Sch TBH-7 Ref: Sch TBH-8 Ref: Sch TBH-9a Ref: Sch TBH-9b PLANT IN SERVICE: 301 Organization Costs \$7,541 \$0 \$7,541 302 2 Franchise Costs 352,403 0 0 0 0 0 352,403 3 303 Land & Land Rights 13,636 0 0 0 0 0 0 13,636 304 Structures & Improvements 401,832 0 0 0 0 0 0 401,832 307 Wells & Springs 2,142,644 0 0 0 0 0 0 2,142,644 310 Power Generation Equipment 549,708 0 0 0 0 0 0 549,708 311 Electric Pumping Equipment 195,407 0 0 0 0 195,407 8 320 Water Treatment Equipment 2,001,053 (2,121,053) 120,000 0 0 9 320.1 Water Treatment Plants 0 1,499,569 0 0 0 0 1,499,569 10 320.2 Solutions & Feeders 0 46.479 0 0 0 0 46,479 11 320.3 Arsenic Media 152,307 (152,307) 0 0 0 0 0 12 320.4 Original Arsenic Media 575.005 (157,503) 0 0 0 0 0 417,503 13 320.5 Regenerated Arsenic Media 152,307 0 0 (1.650)0 0 0 150,657 14 330 Distribution Reservoirs & Standpipes 1,848,872 (1,848,872) 0 0 0 0 0 0 15 330.1 Storage Tank 1,811,998 0 0 1,811,998 0 0 16 330.2 Pressure Tanks 0 36,874 0 0 36.874 17 331 Transmission & Distribution Mains 13,281,053 0 0 0 0 13,281,053 18 333 Services 2,256,719 0 0 0 0 2,256,719 19 334 Meters & Meter Installations 1,489,172 0 0 0 0 0 0 1,489,172 20 335 Hydrants 732,251 0 0 0 0 0 0 732,251 21 Backflow Prevention Devices 1,660 0 0 0 0 0 0 1,660 Other Plant & Misc. Equip. 22 339 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 23 24 340 Office Furniture & Fixtures 160,855 0 0 160,855 0 340.1 Computer & Software 122,607 0 0 0 0 122,607 25 341 Transportation Equipment 139,706 0 0 0 139,706 26 342 Store Equipment 0 0 0 0 0 0 27 343 Tools & Work Equipment 37,840 0 0 0 0 0 0 37,840 28 Laboratory Equipment 132 0 0 0 0 0 0 132 29 345 Power Operated Equipment 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Communications Equipment 30 345 577,721 0 0 577,721 0 0 0 31 347 Miscellaneous Equipment 695 0 0 0 0 0 0 695 32 348 Other Intangibles 1,002,914 0 0 0 0 0 1.002.914 33 Gross Utility Plant in Service \$27,468,728 \$0 (\$37,503) (\$1,650) \$0 **\$**0 **\$**0 \$27,429,576 Less: Accumulated Depreciation 6,309,380 0 (161.732) 0 6,147,648 35 Net Utility Plant in Service (L29 - L30) (\$37,503) (\$1,650) \$21,159,348 \$0 \$161,732 \$0 \$0 \$21,281,927 **DEDUCTIONS** Contributions in Aid of Construction (CIAC) 36 \$7,712,717 **\$**0 **\$**0 **\$**0 **\$**0 \$0 \$7,712,717 \$0 37 Less: Accumulated Amortization 1,376,852 0 0 (22,097)0 1,354,755 38 Net CIAC (L32 - L33) \$6 335 865 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$6,357,962 Advances in Aid of Construction (AIAC) 5.189,497 0 0 0 0 0 0 5,189,497 40 Customer Meter Deposits 52,876 0 0 0 0 0 0 52,876 41 Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes (ADIT) 283,077 0 0 0 0 38,801 321,878 42 Total Deductions \$11,861,315 **\$**0 \$0 \$38,801 \$11,922,213 \$0 \$0 \$22,097 ADDITIONS: Unamortized Finance Charges 43 \$0 \$0 **\$**0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 44 Deferred Tax Assets 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 45 Allowance for Working Capital 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Rounding (1) 0 0 0 47 Total Additions \$0 (\$1) \$0 \$0 \$0 **\$**0 48 ORIGINAL COST RATE BASE \$9,298,032 **\$**0 (\$37,503) \$161,732 (\$1,650) (\$22,097) (\$38,800) \$9,359,714

ADJ No.	Schedule
1	TBH-5
2	TBH-6
3	TBH-7
4	ТВН-8
5a	TBH-9a
5b	TBH-9b

	RATE BASE ADJUSTMENT NO. 1 - Plant Reclassification							
		[A]	[B]	[C]				
LINE		COMPANY		STAFF				
NO.	DESCRIPTION	AS FILED	ADJUSTMENT	ADJUSTED				
1	Water Treatment Equipment	\$2,001,053	(2,121,053)	(\$120,000)				
2	Water Treatment Plants	0	1,499,569	1,499,569				
3	Solutions & Feeders	0	46,479	46,479				
4	Arsenic Media	152,307	(152,307)	0				
5	Original Arsenic Media	0	575,005	575,005				
6	Regenerated Arsenic Media	0	152,307	152,307				
7	Distribution Reservoirs & Standpipes	1,848,872	(1,848,872)	0				
8	Storage Tank	0	1,811,998	1,811,998				
9	Pressure Tanks	0	36,874	36,874				

REFERENÇES:

Column [A]: Company Schedule B-2

Column [B]: Testimony TBH

	RATE BASE ADJUSTMENT NO. 2 - Plant Additions and Retirements							
		[A]	[B]	[C]				
LINE		COMPANY		STAFF				
NO.	DESCRIPTION	AS FILED	ADJUSTMENT	ADJUSTED				
1	Original Arsenic Media Additions (Batch 3.0)	\$0	\$130,000	\$130,000				
2	Original Arsenic Media Retirement (original - Batch 1.0)	0	(287,503)	(287,503)				
3	Water Treatment Equipment (Misclassified)	0	120,000	120,000				
4	Total	\$0	(\$37,503)	(\$37,503)				

REFERENCES:

Column [A]: Company Schedule B-2

Column [B]: Testimony TBH

Column [A] + Column [B]

	RATE BASE ADJUST	MENT NO. 3 - Post-Tes	t Year Plant	
		[A]	[B]	[C]
LINE		COMPANY		STAFF
NO.	DESCRIPTION	AS FILED	ADJUSTMENT	ADJUSTED
1	Regenerated Arsenic Media	\$152,307	(\$1,650)	\$150,657

REFERENCES:

Column [A]: Company Schedule B-2

Column [B]: Testimony TBH

SAHUARITA WATER COMPANY LLC

Docket No. W-03718A-15-0213 Test Year December 31, 2014 **Surrebuttal Schedule TBH-8**

RATE BASE ADJUST	RATE BASE ADJUSTMENT NO. 4 - Accumulated Depreciation						
	[A]	[B]	[C]				
LINE	COMPANY		STAFF				
NO. DESCRIPTION	AS FILED	ADJUSTMENT	ADJUSTED				
1 Accumulated Depreciation	\$6,309,38	0 (\$161,732)	\$6,147,648				

REFERENCES:

Column [A]: Company Schedule B-2

Column [B]: Testimony TBH

RAT	E BASE ADJUSTMENT	NO. 5a - Contributions i	n Aid of Construction	("CIAC") Amortization
		[A]	[B]	[C]
LINE		COMPANY	STAFF	STAFF
NO.	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED	ADJUSTMENT	RECOMMENDED
1	CIAC Amortization	\$1,376,852	(\$22,097)	\$1,354,755
2	Total	\$1,376,852	(\$22,097)	\$1,354,755

References:

Column [A]: Company Schedule C-2 & Workpapers

Column [B]: Testimony TBH, Company Rebuttal Schedule B-2

Docket No. W-03718A-15-0213 Test Year December 31, 2014

RATE BASE ADJUSTMENT NO. 5b - Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes ("ADIT")						
	[A]	[B]	[C]			
LINE	COMPANY	STAFF	STAFF			
NO. DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED	ADJUSTMENT	RECOMMENDED			
1 ADIT	\$283,077	\$38,801	\$321,878			
2 Total	\$283,077	\$38,801	\$321,878			

References:

Column [A]: Company Schedule C-2 & Workpapers

Column [B]: Testimony TBH, Company Rebuttal Schedule B-2

	OPERATING INCOME STATEMENT - ADJUSTED TEST YEAR AND STAFF RECOMMENDED						
		[A]	[B]	l	[C]	[D]	[E]
		COMPANY	',	l	STAFF	''	<u> j</u>
1		ADJUSTED	STAFF		TEST YEAR	STAFF	
LINE	ACCT.	TEST YEAR	TEST YEAR		AS	RECOMMENDED	STAFF
NO.	NO. DESCRIPTION	AS FILED	ADJUSTMENTS	REF	ADJUSTED	CHANGES	RECOMMENDED
1	REVENUES:						
2	461 Metered Water Sales	\$2.042.210	en.		#2 042 24 0	24.44.44.0	** ***
3	460 Water Sales - Unmetered	\$2,843,219 0	\$0		\$2,843,219	\$166,419	\$3,009,638
4	474 Other Operating Revenue	53,527	0		0	0	0
5	Total Operating Revenues	\$2,896,746	<u>0</u> \$0		53,527	0	53,527
3	Total Operating Revenues	\$2,890,740	\$0		\$2,896,746	\$166,419	\$3,063,165
6	OPERATING EXPENSES:						
7	601 Salaries & Wages	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0
8	610 Purchased Water	5,265	0		5,265	0	5,265
9	615 Purchased Power	138,933	0		138,933	0	138,933
10	618 Chemicals	14,734	0		14,734	0	14,734
11	620 Repairs & Maintenance	102,989	(6,584)	1	96,406	0	96,406
12	621 Office Supplies & Expense	0	0		0	0	0
13	630 Contract Services - Accounting	13,497	0		13,497	0	13,497
14	633 Contract Services - Legal	10,603	0		10,603	0	10,603
15	631 Contract Services - Eng	7,968	0		7,968	0	7,968
16	636 Contract Services - Other	126,034	(11,003)	1, 2	115,031	0	115,031
17	634 Management Fees	765,161	(28,894)	3	736,267	0	736,267
18	635 Contractual Services - Water Testing	5,341	8,634	1, 4	13,975	0	13,975
19	641 Rents	1,666	0		1,666	0	1,666
20	650 Transportation Expense	20,650	0		20,650	0	20,650
21	657 Insurance - General Liability	17,137	0		17,137	0	17,137
22	659 Insurance - Health & Life	0	0		0	0	0
23	666 Regulatory Commission Expense - Rate Cas	se 50,000	(20,000)	5	30,000	0	30,000
24	675 Miscellaneous Expense	29,504	0		29,504	0	29,504
25	670 Bad Debt Expense	541	0		541	0	541
26	403 Depreciation Expense	721,109	(22,028)	7	699,081	0	699,081
27	408 Taxes Other than Income	10,350	0		10,350	0	10,350
28	408.11 Property Taxes	154,562	0	8	154,562	2,966	157,528
29	409 Income Tax	102,700	13,195	9	115,895	40,997	156,892
30	Rounding	(1)	0		(1)	0	(1)
31	Total Operating Expenses	\$2,298,743	(\$66,680)		\$2,232,063	\$43,962	\$2,276,025
32	Operating Income (Loss)	\$598,003	\$66,680		\$664,683	\$122,456	\$787,140

References:
Column [A]: Company Schedule C-1
Column [B]: Schedule TBH-11
Column [C]: Column [A] + Column [B]
Column [D]: Schedules TBH-1, TBH-2 and TBH-18
Column [E]: Column [C] + Column [D]

l		[V]	Bl		[0]	a	E	[6]	111		X	E
LINE NO.	ACCT. DESCRIPTION	COMPANY	Expenses Reclass	Contract Services	Mgmt. Fees	Water Testing	Rate Case	Not Used	Depr. Exp.	Prop. Tax	Income Tax	STAFF
]			Ref. Sch TBH-12	Ref. Sch TBH-13	Ref. Sch TBH-14	Ref. Sch TBH-15	Ref. Sch TBH-16	Ref. Sch TBH-17	ž	Re	Ref. Sch TBH-20	ADJUSTED
7 ·	1 KEVENUES:	,										
7	461 Metered Water Sales	\$2,843,219	9	%	0\$	\$ 0	\$0	0\$	\$	\$ 0	0\$	\$2,843,219
3	460 Water Sales - Unmetered	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
4	474 Other Operating Revenue	53,527	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53.527
2	Total Operating Revenues	\$2,896,746	\$0	0\$	0\$	0\$	0\$	0\$	0\$	0\$	0\$	\$2,896,746
Ö 9	6 OPERATING EXPENSES:											
7	601 Salaries & Wages	\$0	\$0	\$0	80	S	OS	0.5	Ş	9	0\$	Ş
∞	610 Purchased Water	5,265	. 0	. 0	. 0	•	g, c	•	•	Ç		3,45
6	615 Purchased Power	138,933	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		138 933
10	618 Chemicals	14,734	0	0	0	0	0	0	· c	0		14 734
11	620 Repairs & Maintenance	102,989	(6,584)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96,406
12	621 Office Supplies & Expense	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		C
13	630 Contract Services - Accounting	13,497	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13.497
14	633 Contract Services - Legal	10,603	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,603
15	631 Contract Services - Eng	7,968	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,968
17	636 Contract Services - Other	126,034	(1,020)	(9,983)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115,031
16	634 Management Fees	765,161	0	0	(28,894)	0	0	0	0	0	0	736.267
18	635 Contractual Services - Water Testing	5,341	7,604	0	0	1,030	0	0	0	0	0	13,975
19	641 Rents	1,666	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,666
20	650 Transportation Expense	20,650	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,650
21	657 Insurance - General Liability	17,137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17,137
22	659 Insurance - Health & Life	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23	666 Regulatory Commission Expense - Rate Case	20,000	0	0	0	0	(20,000)	0	0	0	0	30.000
54	675 Miscellaneous Expense	29,504	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		29 504
25	670 Bad Debt Expense	541	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	541
20	403 Depreciation Expense	721,109	0	0	0	0	0	0	(22,028)	0	0	699.081
27	408 Taxes Other than Income	10,350	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,350
28	408.11 Property Taxes	154,562	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154,562
29	409 Income Tax	102,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13,195	115,895
30	Rounding	(E)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
31	Total Operating Expenses	\$2,298,743	20	(\$9,983)	(\$28,894)	\$1,030	(\$20,000)	0\$	(\$22,028)	\$0	\$13,195	\$2,232,063
32	Operating Income (Loss)	\$598,003	0\$	\$9,983	\$28,894	(\$1,030)	\$20,000	0\$	\$22,028	(J)	(\$13.195)	\$664.683

OPERATING INCOME	ADJUSTMENT NO. 1 - Ex	kpense Reclassificat	ions
	[A]	[B]	[C]
LINE	COMPANY	STAFF	STAFF
NO. DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED	ADJUSTMENT	RECOMMENDED
1 Repairs and Maintenance	\$102,989	(\$6,584)	\$96,406
2 Contract Services - Other	126,034	(1,020)	125,014
3 Water Testing	5,341	7,604	12,945
4 Total	\$234,364	\$0	\$234,364

References:

Column [A]: Company Schedule C-2 & Workpapers

Column [B]: Testimony TBH

OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT NO. 2 - Contractual Services - Other Expense							
	[A]	[B]	[C]				
LINE	COMPANY	STAFF	STAFF				
NO. DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED	ADJUSTMENT	RECOMMENDED				
1 Contractual Services - Other Expense	\$126,034	(\$9,983)	\$116,051				
2 Total	\$126,034	\$126,034 (\$9,983)					
2 10tai	φ120,03 4	(\$9,963)	\$116,0				

Staff Adjustments

Contractual Services - Workman's Comp (Reclass to Mgmt. Services) \$9,983
Total Adjustment \$9,983

References:

Column [A]: Company Schedule C-2 & Workpapers

Column [B]: Testimony TBH

	OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT NO. 3 - Management Fees Expense					
		[A]	[B]	[C]		
LINE		COMPANY	STAFF	STAFF		
NO.	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED	ADJUSTMENT	RECOMMENDED		
1	Management Fees Expense	\$765,161	(\$28,894)	\$736,267		
2	Total	\$765,161	(\$28,894)	\$736,267		
	Staff Adjustments Remove Management Services for Underpayment of Mar. to Nov. 2013 Ex		\$17,407			
	Remove Bonuses with payroll taxes for Non-Dedicated Employees		8,552			
	Remove Bonuses with payroll taxes for Ded	12,918				
	Reclass Workman's Compensation from Con	ntractual Services	(9,983)			
	Total Adjustment		\$28,894			

References:

Column [A]: Company Schedule C-2 & Workpapers

Column [B]: Testimony TBH

OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT NO. 4 - Water Testing Expense					
		[A]	[B]	[C]	
LINE		COMPANY	STAFF	STAFF	
NO.	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED	ADJUSTMENT	RECOMMENDED	
1	Water Testing Expense	\$5,341	\$1,030	\$6,371	
2	Total	\$5,341	\$1,030	\$6,371	

References:

Column [A]: Company Schedule C-2 & Workpapers

Column [B]: Testimony TBH & Staff Engineering Table M

SAHUARITA WATER COMPANY LLC

Surrebuttal Schedule TBH-16

Docket No. W-03718A-15-0213 Test Year December 31, 2014

OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT NO. 5 - Rate Case Expense					
		[A]	[B]	[C]	
LINE		COMPANY	STAFF	STAFF	
NO.	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED	ADJUSTMENT	RECOMMENDED	
1	Rate Case Expense	\$50,000	(\$20,000)	\$30,000	
2	Total	\$50,000	(\$20,000)	\$30,000	

References:

Column [A]: Company Schedule C-2

Column [B]: Testimony TBH

SAHUARITA WATER COMPANY LLC

Surrebuttal Schedule TBH-17

Docket No. W-03718A-15-0213 Test Year December 31, 2014

OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT NO. 6 - Not Used					
		[A]	[B]	[C]	
LINE		COMPANY	STAFF	STAFF	
NO.	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED	ADJUSTMENT	RECOMMENDED	
1	Not Used	\$0	\$0	\$0	
2	Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	

References:

Column [A]: Company Schedule C-2

Column [B]: Testimony TBH

	OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT No. 7 - Depreciation Expense						
			[A]	[B]	[C]	[D]	[E]
	ACCT		GROSS UTILITY	FULLY/NON	DEPRECIABLE	DEPREC.	
No.	NO.	DESCRIPTION	PLANT IN SERVICE	DEPRECIABLE	PLANT	RATE	EXPENSE
		n Service					
1	301	Organization Costs	\$7,541	\$7,541	\$0	0.00%	\$0
2	302	Franchise Costs	352,403	352,403	0	0.00%	0
3	303	Land & Land Rights	13,636	13,636	0	0.00%	0
4	304	Structures & Improvements	401,832		401,832	3.33%	13,381
5	307	Wells & Springs	2,142,644		2,142,644	3.33%	71,350
6	310	Power Generation Equipment	549,708		549,708	5.00%	27,485
7	311	Electric Pumping Equipment	195,407		195,407	12.50%	24,426
8	320	Water Treatment Equipment					
9	320.1	Water Treatment Plants	1,499,569		1,499,569	3.33%	49,936
10	320.2	Solutions & Feeders	46,479	46,479	0	20.00%	0
11	320.3	Point Of Use Systems	0		0	10.00%	0
12	320.4	Original Arsenic Media	417,503		417,503	6.67%	27,835
13	320.5	Regenerated Arsenic Media	150,657		150,657	40.00%	60,263
14	330	Distribution Reservoirs & Standpipes	2000		201	Section 1	
15	330.1	Storage Tank	1,811,998		1,811,998	2.22%	40,226
16	330.2	Pressure Tanks	36,874		36,874	5.00%	1,844
17	331	Transmission & Distribution Mains	13,281,053		13,281,053	2.00%	265,621
18	333	Services	2,256,719		2,256,719	3.33%	75,149
19	334	Meters & Meter Installations	1,489,172		1,489,172	8.33%	124,048
20	335	Hydrants	732,251		732,251	2.00%	14,645
21	336	Backflow Prevention Devices	1,660		1,660	6.67%	111
22	339	Other Plant & Misc. Equip.	0		0	6.67%	0
23	340	Office Furniture & Fixtures	160,855		160,855	6.67%	10,729
24	340.1	Computer & Software	122,607	67,883	54,724	20.00%	10,945
25	341	Transportation Equipment	139,706	123,399	16,307	20.00%	3,261
26	342	Store Equipment	0		0	4.00%	0
27	343	Tools & Work Equipment	37,840		37,840	5.00%	1,892
28	344	Laboratory Equipment	132		132	10.00%	13
29	345	Power Operated Equipment	0		0	5.00%	0
30	345	Communications Equipment	577,721		577,721	10.00%	57,772
31	347	Miscellaneous Equipment	695		695	10.00%	70
32	348	Other Intangibles	1,002,914		1,002,914	10.00%	100,291
		Rounding	-	(1)	1	-	0
33		Subtotal General	\$27,429,576	\$611,340	\$26,818,236		\$981,293
34		Less: Amortization of Contributions			\$7,712,717	3.66%_	\$282,212
31		Staff Recommended Depreciation Expense					\$699,081
32		Company Proposed Depreciation Expense					721,109
33		Increase/(Decrease) to Depreciation Expens	se			-	(\$22,028)

SAHUARITA WATER COMPANY LLC

Docket No. W-03718A-15-0213 Test Year December 31, 2014

OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT No. 8 - Property Taxes Expense

ĺ		[A]	[B]
LINE		STAFF	STAFF
NO.	DESCRIPTION	AS ADJUSTED	RECOMMENDED
1	Staff Adjusted Test Year Revenues	\$2,896,746	\$2,896,746
2	Weight Factor	2	2
3	Subtotal (Line 1 * Line 2)	\$5,793,492	\$5,793,492
4	Staff Recommended Revenue	2,896,746	3,063,165
5	Subtotal (Line 4 + Line 5)	\$8,690,238	\$8,856,657
6	Number of Years	3	3
7	Three Year Average (Line 5 / Line 6)	\$2,896,746	\$2,952,219
8	Department of Revenue Multiplier	2	2
9	Revenue Base Value (Line 7 * Line 8)	\$5,793,492	\$5,904,438
10	Plus: 10% of CWIP (Company Excluded)	0	0
11	Less: Net Book Value of Licensed Vehicles	11,415	11,415
12	Full Cash Value (Line 9 + Line 10 - Line 11)	\$5,782,077	\$5,893,023
13	Assessment Ratio	18.00%	18.00%
14	Assessment Value (Line 12 * Line 13)	\$1,040,774	\$1,060,744
15	Composite Property Tax Rate - Obtained from ADOR	14.85070%	14.85070%
16	Staff Test Year Adjusted Property Tax Expense (Line 14 * Line 15)	\$154,562	
17	Company Proposed Property Tax	154,562	
18	Staff Test Year Adjustment (Line 16 - Line 17)	\$0	
19	Property Tax - Staff Recommended Revenue (Line 14 * Line 15)		\$157,528
20	Staff Test Year Adjusted Property Tax Expense (Line 16)		154,562
21	Increase in Property Tax Due to Increase in Revenue Requirement		\$2,966
22	Increase in Property Tax Due to Increase in Revenue Requirement (Line 21)		\$2,966
23	Increase in Revenue Requirement		\$166,419
24	Increase in Property Tax Per Dollar Increase in Revenue (Line 22 / Line 23)		1.782084%

REFERENCES:

Line 15: Composite Tax Rate obtained from Arizona Department of Revenue

Line 17: Company Schedule C-1 Page 2

Line 21: Line 19 - Line 20

Line 23: Schedule TBH-10

OPERATING INCOME ADJUSTMENT NO. 9 - Income Tax Expense					
[A] [B] [C]					
LINE		COMPANY	STAFF	STAFF	
NO.	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED	ADJUSTMENT	RECOMMENDED	
1	Income Tax Expense	\$102,700	\$13,195	\$115,895	
2	Total	\$102,700	\$13,195	\$115,895	

References:

Column [A]: Company Schedule C-2

Column [B]: Testimony TBH

	RATE DESIGN		
	Present	Company	Staff
Monthly Usage Charge	Rates	Proposed Rates	Recommended Rates
5/8 x 3/4" Meter	Ø177 1.5	610.10	#40.2F
3/4" Meter	\$17.15 26.80	\$19.12 28.68	\$18.35 28.00
1" Meter	42.88	47.81	43.98
1½" Meter	85.75	95.61	86.85
2" Meter	137.20	152.98	138.30
3" Meter	274.40	305.96	275.50
4" Meter	428.75	478.06	429.85
6" Meter	857.50	956.11	858.60
	Present	Company	Staff
Commodity Rates	Rates	Proposed Rates	Recommended Rates
5/0 2/48 9 2/48 M			
5/8 x 3/4" & 3/4" Meter - Residential Gallons Included in Minimum	0		
Excess of Minimum - per 1,000 Gallons	0	0	0
From 1 to 3,000 Gallons	\$2.500	\$2.888	\$2.750
From 3,001 to 9,000 Gallons	3.750	_	
Over 9,000 Gallons	4.500		
			1.7.10
5/8 x 3/4" & 3/4" Meter - Commercial & Industrial			
Gallons Included in Minimum	0	0	0
Excess of Minimum - per 1,000 Gallons			
From 1 to 9,000 Gallons	\$3.750	\$4.188	\$3.900
Over 9,000 Gallons	4.500	4.988	4.740
1" - Residential, Commercial & Industrial			
Gallons Included in Minimum	0	0	0
Excess of Minimum - per 1,000 Gallons	:		
From 1 to 20,000 Gallons	\$3.750	\$4.188	\$3.900
Over 20,000 Gallons	4.500	4.988	4.740
1½" - Residential, Commercial & Industrial			
Gallons Included in Minimum	0	0	0
Excess of Minimum - per 1,000 Gallons	#2 750	# 4.100	#2.0 00
From 1 to 55,000 Gallons Over 55,000 Gallons	\$3.750	\$4.188	\$3.900
Over 55,000 Gallons	4.500	4.988	4.740
2" - Residential, Commercial & Industrial			
Gallons Included in Minimum	0	0	0
Excess of Minimum - per 1,000 Gallons			_
From 1 to 90,000 Gallons	\$3.750	\$4.188	\$3.900
Over 90,000 Gallons	4.500	4.988	4.740
all Duid-wid Co			
3" - Residential, Commercial & Industrial Gallons Included in Minimum	^	^	_
	0	0	0
Excess of Minimum - per 1,000 Gallons From 1 to 200,000 Gallons	\$3.750	¢ / 100	#2.000
Over 200,000 Gallons	\$3.750 4.500	\$4.188 4.988	\$3.900 4.740
Over 200,000 Ganons	4.500	4.988	4.740
4" - Residential, Commercial & Industrial			
Gallons Included in Minimum	0	0	0
Excess of Minimum - per 1,000 Gallons	Ĭ,		Ů
From 1 to 350,000 Gallons	\$3.750	\$4.188	\$3.900
Over 350,000 Gallons	4.500	4.988	4.740
·			

SAHUARITA WATER COMPANY LLC Docket No. W-03718A-15-0213 Test Year December 31, 2014

RATE DESIGN CONT.					·				
	Present			Company			Staff		
Commodity Rates	ļ	Rates		Proposed Rates		Recommended Rates		d Rates	
6" - Residential, Commercial & Industrial									
Gallons Included in Minimum	1		0			0			0
Excess of Minimum - per 1,000 Gallons									
From 1 to 750,000 Gallons			\$3.750	ľ		\$4.188			\$3.900
Over 750,000 Gallons			4.500			4.988	!		4.740
Construction/Bulk									
Gallons Included in Minimum	1		0			0			0
Excess of Minimum - per 1,000 Gallons			:						
All Gallons			\$4.500			\$4.988			\$4.740
	3								
	Present			Company			Staff		
Service Line and Meter Installation Charges	 	Rates	nn . 1		roposed R		·	ommende	
	Service Line	Meter	Total	Service	Meter	Total	Service	Meter	Total
5/8" x 3/4" Meter	1.ine \$445	Charge \$155	Charge \$600	Line \$445	Charge \$155	Charge \$600	Line \$445	Charge \$155	Charge \$600
3/4" Meter	445	255	700	445	255	700	445	255	700
1" Meter	495	315	810	495	315	810	495	315	810
1½" Meter	550	525	1,075	550	525	1,075	550	525	1,075
2" Turbine Meter	830	1,045	1,875	830	1,045	1,875	830	1,045	1,875
2" Compound Meter	830	1,890	2,720	830	1,890	2,720	830	1,890	2,720
3" Turbine Meter	1,045	1,670	2,715	1,045	1,670	2,715	1,045	1,670	2,715
3" Compound Meter	1,165	2,545	3,710	1,165	2,545	3,710	1,165	2,545	3,710
4" Turbine Meter	1,490	2,670	4,160	1,490	2,670	4,160	1,490	2,670	4,160
4" Compound Meter	1,670	3,645	5,315	1,670	3,645	5,315	1,670	3,645	5,315
6" Turbine Meter	2,210	5,025	7,235	2,210	5,025	7,235	2,210	5,025	7,235
6" Compound Meter Over 6"	2,330 At Cost	6,920 At Cost	9,250 At Cost	2,330 At Cost	6,920 At Cost	9,250 At Cost	2,330 At Cost	6,920 At Cost	9,250 At Cost
	710 0031	111 0031	711 0031	711 0031	71t COSt	,	711 COST	711 COSt	Al Cost
Service Charges									
Establishment or Reestablishment of Water Utility Service:									
Establishment			\$25.00			\$25.00			\$25.00
Establishment (after hours) Reestablishment (within 12 months)			40.00 *			N/A			N/A
Reconnection of Water Utility Service:						T.			Ψ.
During normal business hours			25.00			25.00			N/A
During non-business hours			40.00			N/A			N/A
Reconnection (delinquent)			N/A			N/A			25.00
After Hours Service Charge			N/A			50.00			50.00
Meter Test (if correct)			25.00			25.00			25.00
Meter Re-Read			N/A			25.00			25.00
Deposit Requirement			**			**			**
Deposit Interest			6%			6%			6%
NSF Check Deformed Payment (paymenth)			15.00			15.00			15.00
Deferred Payment (per month) Late Charge (per month)			1.5% ***			1.5% ***			1.5% ***
Charge of Moving Customer Meter - Customer Request			At Cost			At Cost			At Cost
Main Extension and Additional Facilities			At Cost			At Cost			At Cost
* Des Commission D. L. A. A. C. DALLO (CO.D. No. 1)									
* Per Commission Rule A.A.C. R14-2-403.D. Number									
of months off the system times the monthly minimum.									
** Per Commission Rules (R14-2-403.B)									
*** Minimum \$5.00 or 1.5% per month.									

SAHUARITA WAT Docket No. W-0371	ER COMPANY LLC			., .,	Surrebuttal Sch	edule TBH-22
Test Year Decembe						
			AL BILL ANALYSIS			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	General Ser	rvice 5/8 x 3/4-Inch M	leter	1	r · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			Present	Proposed	Dollar	Percent
Company Proposed	Gallons		Rates	Rates	Increase	Increase
Average Usage	4,677		\$30.94	\$34.81	\$3.87	12.50%
Median Usage	4,500		\$30.28	\$34.07	\$3.79	12.52%
Ü			·			
Staff Recommended						
Average Usage	4,677		\$30.94	\$33.14	\$2.20	7.12%
Median Usage	4,500		\$30.28 \$32.45 \$2.1		\$2.18	7.18%
	<u> </u>					
			posed Rates (Without ' vice 5/8 x 3/4-Inch M	,		
			Company		Staff	
Gallons Present		Proposed	%	Recommended	%	
	Minimum Charge	\$17.15	Minimum Charge	\$19.12	Minimum Charge	\$18.35
	1st Tier Rate	\$2.500	1st Tier Rate	\$2.888	1st Tier Rate	\$2.750
	1st Tier Break-over	3,000	1st Tier Break-over	3,000	1st Tier Break-over	3,000
	2nd Tier Rate 2nd Tier Break-over	\$3.750	2nd Tier Rate	\$4.188	2nd Tier Rate	\$3.900
		9,000	2nd Tier Break-over	9,000	2nd Tier Break-over	9,000
Consumption	3rd Tier Rate Rates	\$4.500	3rd Tier Rate Rates	\$4.988 Increase	3rd Tier Rate Rates	\$4.740 Increase
-	\$17.15		\$19.12	11.49%	\$18.35	7.00%
1,000	\$19.65		\$22.01	12.00%	\$10.53 \$21.10	7.00%
2,000	\$22.15		\$24.90	12.40%	\$23.85	7.67%
3,000	\$24.65		\$27.78	12.71%	\$26.60	7.91%
4,000	\$28.40		\$31.97	12.58%	\$30.50	7.39%
5,000	\$32.15		\$36.16	12.47%	\$34.40	7.00%
6,000	\$35.90		\$40.35	12.39%	\$38.30	6.69%
7,000	\$39.65		\$44.54	12.32%	\$42.20	6.43%
8,000	\$43.40		\$48.72	12.27%	\$46.10	6.22%
9,000	\$47.15		\$52.91	12.22%	\$50.00	6.04%
10,000	\$51.65		\$57.90	12.10%	\$54.74	5.98%
11,000	\$56.15		\$62.89	12.00%	\$59.48	5.93%
12,000	\$60.65		\$67.88	11.91%	\$64.22	5.89%
13,000	\$65.15		\$72.86	11.84%	\$68.96	5.85%
14,000	\$69.65		\$77.85	11.78%	\$73.70	5.81%
15,000	\$74.15		\$82.84	11.72%	\$78.44	5.79%
16,000	\$78.65	ļ	\$87.83	11.67%	\$83.18	5.76%
17,000	\$83.15		\$92.82	11.62%	\$87.92	5.74%
18,000	\$87.65		\$97.80	11.58%	\$92.66	5.72%
19,000	\$92.15		\$102.79	11.55%	\$97.40	5.70%
20,000	\$96.65		\$107.78	11.52%	\$102.14	5.68%
25,000	\$119.15		\$132.72	11.39%	\$125.84	5.61%
30,000	\$141.65	ľ	\$157.66	11.30%	\$149.54	5.57%
35,000	\$164.15	}	\$182.60	11.24%	\$173.24	5.54%
40,000	\$186.65		\$207.54	11.19%	\$196.94	5.51%
45,000	\$209.15		\$232.48	11.15%	\$220.64	5.49%
50,000	\$231.65		\$257.42	11.12%	\$244.34	5.48%
75,000	\$344.15		\$382.12	11.03%	\$362.84	5.43%
100,000	\$456.65		\$506.82	10.99%	\$481.34	5.41%

Sahuarita Water Company, LLC W-03718A-15-0213

ATTACHMENT A

SAHUARITA WATER COMPANY, LLC DOCKET NO. W-03718A-15-0213 RESPONSE TO STAFF'S FIRST SET OF DATA REQUESTS

Date:

August 19, 2015

Response provided by:

Marian Homiak

Title:

Controller

Company Name:

Sahuarita Water Company, LLC

Address:

4549 East Ft Lowell Road

Tucson, AZ 85712

Company Response Number:

TBH 1.34

Q.

<u>Incentive Pay (included in the Management Fees)</u> – Please provide the following information:

- a. A detailed explanation for any incentive plans in existence during the years of 2012, 2013 and 2014.
- b. For all incentive plans in effect during the Test Year, please provide documentation explain how the plan works.
- c. The total dollar amount of incentive pay included in the test year income statement of your application.
- d. Please state the account numbers used to record incentive pay.

RESPONSE:

- a. It is the general policy for management to give, at its discretion a yearend bonus to employees for their work over the past year.
- b. There is nothing in writing and it is entirely up to the Managing Partner. Items that are considered are overall performance and vehicle use. During the year, employees are not reimbursed for the use of their private vehicles and this is also taken into consideration at the end of the year.
- c. The total dollar amount of incentive pay (bonus) included in the test year income statement of our application is:

Dedicated Employees:

\$12,000.00

Non-Dedicated Employees:

8,552.44

d. AC#634.8

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

DOUG LITTLE
Chairman
BOB STUMP
Commissione
BOB BURNS
Commissione
TOM FORESE
Commissione
ANDY TOBIN
Commissione

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) DOCKET NO. W-03718A-15-0213 SAHUARITA WATER COMPANY, LLC AN ARIZONA WATER CORPORATION, FOR A) DETERMINATION OF THE CURRENT FAIR) VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PROPERTY AND) FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF JUST AND) REASONABLE RATES AND CHARGES.)

SURREBUTTAL

TESTIMONY

OF

MICHAEL S. THOMPSON, P. E.

UTILITIES ENGINEER

UTILITIES DIVISION

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

APRIL 1, 2016

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY SAHUARITA WATER COMPANY, LLC DOCKET NO. W-03718A-15-0213

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. Staff recommends that the original arsenic media be given an average useful service life of 15 years, and a depreciation rate of 6.67 percent.
- 2. Staff further recommends that regenerated arsenic media be given an average useful service life of 2 ½ years, and a depreciation rate of 40 percent.
- 3. Staff further recommends that SWC use the Staff recommended depreciation rates shown in Exhibit MST-1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY	1
ORIGINAL & REGENERATED ARSENIC MEDIA DEPRECIATION	1
<u>EXHIBIT</u>	
DEPRECIATION RATE TABLE	MST-1

Surrebuttal Testimony of Michael S. Thompson, P. E. Docket No. WS-03718A-15-0213 Page 1

INTRODUCTION

- Q. Please state your name and business address.
- A. My name is Michael Thompson. My business address is 1200 West Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

Q. By whom and in what position are you employed?

- A. I am employed by the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission" or "ACC") as a Utilities Engineer Water/Wastewater in the Utilities Division.
- Q. Did you submit Direct Testimony on behalf of the ACC Utilities Division Staff ("Staff") in this case?
- A. Yes.

PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

- Q. What is the purpose of your Surrebuttal Testimony?
- A. To respond to the Rebuttal Testimony filed by Geoff Caron on behalf of Sahuarita Water Company, LLC ("SWC"). My testimony addresses Mr. Caron's comments regarding the depreciation of the original and regenerated arsenic media.

ORIGINAL & REGENERATED ARSENIC MEDIA DEPRECIATION

- Q. Does Staff agree with Mr. Caron's recommended depreciation rates for the original and regenerated arsenic media?
- A. Yes. After an extensive conversation with Mr. Caron and a review of additional information provided by SWC, Staff was able to reach a better understanding of the operational/performance aspects of the arsenic media. Therefore, Staff has modified its position and is recommending that the original arsenic media be given an average useful

depreciation rate of 40 percent.

5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

14

15

A. Yes, it does.

Q. Has Staff revised its depreciation rate table to reflect the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners ("NARUC") Accounts for the original and regenerated arsenic media?

service life of 15 years, and a depreciation rate of 6.67 percent. Staff further recommends

that regenerated arsenic media be given an average useful service life of 2 ½ years, and a

A. Yes. Staff revised the depreciation table to include NARUC Account No. 320.4 – Arsenic Media, and NARUC Account No. 320.5 – Regenerated Arsenic Media. Staff's revised depreciation table, attached to this testimony, is shown on Exhibit MST-1. Staff recommends that SWC use the Staff recommended depreciation rates shown in Exhibit MST-1.

Q. Does this conclude your Surrebuttal Testimony?

DEPRECIATION RATES FOR WATER COMPANIES

NARUC Account No.	Depreciable Plant	Average Service Life (Years)	Annual Accrual Rate (%)
301	Organization		0.00
302	Franchises		0.00
303	304 Structures & Improvements		0.00
304	8		3.33
305	Collecting & Impounding Reservoirs	40	2.50
306	Lake, River, Canal Intakes	40	2.50
307	Wells & Springs	30	3.33
308	Infiltration Galleries	15	6.67
309 Raw Water Supply Mains		50	2.00
310 Power Generation Equipment		20	5.00
311	Pumping Equipment	8	12.5
320	Water Treatment Equipment	11, 12, 13	
320.1	Water Treatment Plants	30	3.33
320.2	Solution Chemical Feeders	5	20.00
320.3	Point-of-Use Treatment Devices	10	10.00
320.4	Arsenic Treatment Media	15	6.67
320.5	Arsenic Treatment Media Regeneration	2.5	40.00
330	Distribution Reservoirs & Standpipes	0.498	
330.1	Storage Tanks	. 45	2.22
330.2	Pressure Tanks	20	5.00
331	Transmission & Distribution Mains	50	2.00
333	Services	30	3.33
334	Meters	12	8.33
335	Hydrants	50	2.00
336	Backflow Prevention Devices	15	6.67
339	Other Plant & Misc. Equipment	15	6.67
340	Office Furniture & Equipment	15	6.67
340.1	Computers & Software	5	20.00
341	Transportation Equipment	5	20.00
342	Stores Equipment	25	4.00
343	Tools, Shop & Garage Equipment	20	5.00
344	Laboratory Equipment	10	10.00
345	Power Operated Equipment	20	5.00
346	Communication Equipment	10	10.00
347	Miscellaneous Equipment	10	10.00
348	Other Tangible Plant	10	10.00

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

DOUG LITTLE
Chairman
BOB STUMP
Commissioner
BOB BURNS
Commissioner
TOM FORESE
Commissioner
ANDY TOBIN
Commissioner

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
SAHUARITA WATER COMPANY, LLC, FOR A
DETERMINATION OF THE CURRENT FAIR
VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PROPERTY AND FOR
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF JUST AND
REASONABLE RATES AND CHARGES
)

DOCKET NO. W-03718A-15-0213

SURREBUTTAL

TESTIMONY

OF

CRYSTAL S. BROWN

EXECUTIVE CONSULTANT III

UTILITIES DIVISION

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	STAFF'S RESPONSE TO THE REBUTTAL TESTIMONY FILED BY COST OF CAPITAL WITNESS, MR. THOMAS J. BOURASSA	THE COMPANY'S
	Comments Regarding Staff's Range of COEs	5
III.	STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	7
	SURREBUTTAL SCHEDULES	
Cap	pital Structure and Weighted Cost of Capital	CSB-1
Inte	entionally Left Blank	CSB-2
Fin:	al Cost of Equity Estimates for Sample Water Utilities	CSB-3
Ave	erage Capital Structure of Sample Water Utilities	CSB-4
Gro	owth in Earnings & Dividends of Sample Water Utilities	
Sus	tainable Growth for Sample Water Utilities	CSB-6
Sele	ected Financial Data of Sample Water Utilities	CSB-7
Cal	culation of Expected Infinite Annual Growth in Dividends	CSB-8
Mu	lti-Stage DCF Estimates	CSB-9
Cos	st of Capital Calculation Capitalization	CCD 10

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY SAHUARITA WATER COMPANY, LLC, DOCKET NO. W-03718A-15-0213

Staff continues to recommend an 8.41 percent rate of return. Staff's recommended rate of return was calculated using a 9.50 percent cost of equity, a 4.20 percent cost of debt, and a capital structure consisting of 20.57 percent debt and 79.43 percent equity.

Surrebuttal Testimony of Crystal S. Brown Docket No. W-03718A-15-0213 Page 1

I. INTRODUCTION Q. Please state your name, occupation, and business address.

A. My name is Crystal S. Brown. I am an Executive Consultant III employed by the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") in the Utilities Division ("Staff"). My business address is 1200 West Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

Q. Are you the same Crystal S. Brown who filed direct testimony in this case?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony in this rate proceeding?

A. The purpose of my surrebuttal testimony is to respond to the cost of capital rebuttal testimony of Sahuarita Water Company's ("Sahuarita" or "Company") witness, Thomas J. Bourassa.

Q. Please explain how Staff's surrebuttal testimony is organized.

A. Staff's surrebuttal testimony is presented in three sections. Section I is this introduction. Section II presents Staff's comments on the rebuttal testimony of the Company's cost of capital witness, Mr. Bourassa. Lastly, Section III presents Staff's recommendations.

II. STAFF'S RESPONSE TO THE REBUTTAL TESTIMONY FILED BY THE COMPANY'S COST OF CAPITAL WITNESS, MR. THOMAS J. BOURASSA

- Q. Please summarize the capital structure, cost of debt, cost of equity, and overall weighted average cost of capital proposed in Mr. Bourassa's rebuttal testimony.
- A. In his rebuttal testimony, Mr. Bourassa is proposing a capital structure consisting of 20.57 percent debt and 79.43 percent equity. Mr. Bourassa proposes a 10.5 percent cost of equity

("COE") and a 4.2 percent cost of debt for the Company. Mr. Bourassa's cost of capital proposals result in an overall rate of return ("ROR") for Sahuarita of 9.2 percent.

The 10.5 percent rebuttal return on equity ("ROE") proposal being made by Mr. Bourassa is the same as his 10.5 percent ROE proposal found in his direct testimony. Staff's ROE recommendation is 9.5 percent in both its direct and surrebuttal cost of capital filings.

Q. Is there a primary conceptual basis for the difference in the ROE proposals of the Company and the ROE recommendations supported by Staff?

A. Yes. The Company follows what is called a company-specific approach to developing its ROE proposal, whereas Staff follows the portfolio approach to defining its fair and reasonable ROE recommendation. I will discuss the differences in these two approaches in my testimony but generally both approaches rely on the results generated from application of the discounted cash flow ("DCF") and capital asset pricing model ("CAPM") ROE models. The Company then adds the results of a number of company-specific risk considerations whereas, under Staff's portfolio approach, such risk adders are not directly given consideration because in the capital markets such risks can be, and are, addressed by diversification of the investor's portfolio so ratepayers should not be required to compensate for a risk that can be reasonably, and simply, addressed through an investment tool existing in the market place. That tool is "portfolio diversification."

On page 5, line 21, of Mr. Bourassa's rebuttal testimony he says that investors "do not ignore" the various company-specific risks that exist. Staff agrees with this statement which is exactly why prudent investors diversify their portfolios. And since portfolio diversification is both a simple and logical step for investors to take to safeguard their investments from

such risks, there is no reason for ratepayers to be required to compensate investors for these risks.

3

4

Comments Regarding Staff's Range of COEs

5

Q. Did Staff review the Company's comments concerning Staff's position that any COE in Staff's range of COE's is reasonable?

6 7

A. Yes.

8

9

Q. What were the Company's comments?

11

10

A.

median) is arguably the most 'fair' estimate . . ." of a range of COE's, but he goes on to

1213

suggest that under the *Bluefield* and *Hope* standards further specific consideration of other risk factors must be made, which then leads Mr. Bourassa into a lengthy discussion of other

Mr. Bourassa concludes on page 14, line 7, that "... the mid-point (and sometimes the

14

company-specific risk considerations that he ultimately suggests he has been able to specifically measure from the perspective of Sahuarita Water, e.g., risk "X" requires a "19"

15

basis point adjustment whereas risk "Z" requires a further "17" basis point adjustment to

1617

18

Q.

Does Staff agree?

ROEs.

19 20

21

22

A. No, Staff does not. The *Hope* and *Bluefield* Supreme Court decisions which Mr. Bourassa makes reference to set forth the standard criteria which must result from a Commission's ROE decision in order to conclude that the ROE constitutes a fair rate of return. Staff notes

23

24

1. Prescribe the types of COE models to be used

that those court decisions do not:

2526

2. Prescribe that a certain number of COE models be used, and

3. Prescribe that an exact point within a range of COE's be used

Rather, the *Hope* and *Bluefield* Supreme Court decisions identify certain criteria that must be met for a rate of return to be deemed "fair." Those criteria are capital attraction, financial integrity, and comparable earnings. The DCF and CAPM models are foundational cost of capital ("COC") models that have been recognized as models that generate results that meet these criteria. Also, these models are widely used by other public utility commissions; are taught in National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners ("NARUC") training classes; and have been adopted for establishing reasonable ROE ranges by this Commission for at least 25 years.

Therefore, since the DCF and CAPM models produce results that meet the fairness standards of the *Hope* and *Bluefield* court cases and Staff used the DCF and CAPM models to calculate each of the points in Staff's ROE reasonableness range, then any point in Staff's range of COE's is reasonable and fair.

Comments Regarding Moving Higher Than the Low Point of Staff's Model-Driven ROE Range

- Q. Would you please clarify Staff's statement that "moving higher than the low point of the range makes a reasonable acknowledgement of, or concession to, the other risk factors"?
- A. Yes. First, let me say that Staff acknowledges that all models or approaches used to defining a fair ROE range can have shortcomings, even if what are termed to be shortcomings are simply differences of professional judgement regarding the assumptions to be made in generating results from these generally accepted models. There is no perfect or absolute way to determine "required return" in a constantly changing financial marketplace. So, by moving above the low result from Staff's model-driven ROE range, Staff is merely trying to find

common ground with those who are of the opinion that investors actually require a higher ROE because of consideration "A" or "B".

- Q. By suggesting that any point within its model-driven ROE range would be a reasonable ROE for the Commission to authorize, and by using an ROE above the low point of Staff's model-driven ROE range in its revenue requirement schedules, is Staff also attempting to find common ground with parties that might argue that one more model variation, or one more approach to developing the ROE range should be given consideration?
- A. Yes.

Compensation for Company Specific Risk

- Q. Should investors expect to be compensated for company-specific risk?
- A. No, they should not. The type of risk that investors should expect to be compensated for are systematic risks (i.e., market risks). Quite simply, market risks cannot be diversified away because investors can and certainly do diversify their investment portfolios as the means for effectively safeguarding their investments from company-specific risk. This point is made on page 52 of Mr. Roger Morin, Ph.D.'s book Regulatory Finance, Utilities' Cost of Capital, where he states, "Thus, for a diversified investor, the relevant risk of a security is reduced to its market risk, or beta, the risk that cannot be diversified away." Therefore, investors should not be expected to be compensated for company-specific risks as those risks can be diversified away.

In Staff's opinion, anyone who argues that investors must be directly compensated for company-specific risk is also arguing that for some reason ratepayers must step up and compensate for a specific investor's failure to take advantage of a simple investment tool – that being portfolio diversification. Such advocates typically go to great lengths to suggest

that they have developed a way to quantify exactly what level of compensation an investor requires for each element of company-specific risk. This is totally unnecessary. The failure on the part of an investor to diversify his/her portfolio is *not* a decision that should become a financial obligation of ratepayers.

Q. Is systematic (i.e., market) risk addressed and incorporated in both the DCF model and the CAPM?

 A. Yes. The DCF Model is a cash flow assessment tool used to derive the COE. For the DCF, it is assumed that all cash flow items have equivalent exposure to systematic risk. For the CAPM, systematic risk is reflected in the Beta which measures a stock's riskiness compared to the market as a whole.

Comments Regarding Comparing Staff's Recommended COE to that of the Proxy Group

- Q. Mr. Bourassa asserted that investors would be better off investing in publically traded companies (i.e., his proxy group of companies) than from investing in Sahuarita Water. This discussion starts on page 8 of Mr. Bourassa's rebuttal testimony and the actual statement regarding such assertion appears on page 10 of this testimony. Is this a reasonable comparison?
- A. No, it is not. An investor in the proxy group does not have the same level of influence over management decisions as do principal investors in Sahuarita. The influence of the principal investors includes, but is not limited to, controlling the amount and timing of rate increases, plant additions, and having complete access to the cash provided by operating income and depreciation expense. The principal investors can use this cash for any purpose they choose.

Staff does not intend to get into a lengthy discussion regarding this point, but this ability to influence management decision making to the benefit of the primary investors in Sahuarita is

an observable reality, and the value of such influence is omitted by Mr. Bourassa as he discusses and then quantifies the firm-specific risks faced by Sahuarita's investors.

For example, Schedule E-2 of the Company's application shows that Sahuarita reported operating income during the years 2012 to 2014 of \$974,050 in 2012, \$764,382 in 2013, and \$739,570 in 2014. As shown on Schedule E-4, the amount of distributions during the same period were \$328,049 in 2012, \$450,000 in 2013, and \$2,067,562 in 2014. Effectively, Sahuarita's principal investors were able to "draw" \$367,6091 more than the Company made during this period of time. This suggests a significant ability to influence management's distribution making decisions that investors in the proxy group do not have.

This ability to influence management decisions is one of the main reasons why Sahuarita's ROE should not be unequivocally compared to the achieved and forecasted ROE's of the proxy group as Mr. Bourassa has done. Instead, a reasonable comparison would be to the ROEs recently authorized by the Commission for other ACC-regulated water and wastewater companies.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

- Q. In updating its COC analysis for the Company, did Staff's recommended ROE and overall ROR change from the levels recommended by Staff in direct testimony?
- A. No, it did not. Staff recommended the highest COE in the range; this COE did not change after the update was performed.
- Q. What are Staff's recommendations for the Company?
- A. Staff recommends the following for Sahuarita's cost of capital:

 $^{^{1}}$ (\$974,050 + \$764,382 + \$739,570) - (\$328,049 + \$450,000 + \$2,067,567) = -\$367,609

Surrebuttal Testimony of Crystal S. Brown Docket No. W-03718A-15-0213 Page 8

- 1
- 1. A capital structure of 20.57 percent debt and 79.43 percent equity.
- 2
- 2. A 4.20 percent cost of debt.
- 3
- 3. A 9.50 percent return on equity.
- 4
- 4. An 8.41 percent overall rate of return.

5

- Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?
- 7

6

A. Yes, it does.

Sahuarita Water Company, Inc. Cost of Capital Calculation Capital Structure And Weighted Average Cost of Capital Staff Recommended and Company Proposed

[A]	[B]	[C]	[D]
Description	Weight (%)	Cost	Weighted Cost
Staff Recommended Capital Structure			
Debt	20.57%	4.20%	0.86%
Common Equity	79.43%	9.50%	7.55%
Weighted Average Cost of Capital			8.41%
Company Proposed Capital Structure			
Debt	20.57%	4.20%	0.86%
Common Equity	79.43%	10.50%	8.34%
Weighted Average Cost of Capital			9.20%

[D]: [B] x [C]

Supporting Schedules: CSB-3 and CSB-4.

Intentionally left blank

Sahuarita Water Company, Inc. Cost of Capital Calculation Final Cost of Equity Estimates Sample Water Utilities

		WARRAN 4 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	
Ē	k 7.9% <u>8.7%</u> 8.30%	<u>k</u> 7.6% 9. <u>5%</u> 8.60%	9.5% 0.0% 9.50% 0.0% 9.50%
	II II II	11 11 11	
	5.6%	(Rp) 7.6% 9.2%	t of Equity Adjustment Sub-Total Adjustment Total
	+ +	× × ×	l Cost o ient Adj Sı Sisk Adj
	$\frac{\mathbf{D_1/P_0}^1}{2.3\%}$	B ° 0.73 0.73	Staff's Estimated Cost of Equity Economic Assessment Adjustment Sub-Total Financial Risk Adjustment Total
		+ + +	Staf
(B)		Rf 2.1% 2.9%	
[A]	DCF Method Constant Growth DCF Estimate Multi-Stage DCF Estimate Average DCF Estimate	CAPM Method Historical Market Risk Premium ² Current Market Risk Premium ⁴ Average CAPM Estimate	

¹ MSN Money and Value Line

² Schedule JAC-8

³ Risk-free rate (Rf) for 5, 7, and 10 year Treasury rates from the U.S. Treasury Department at www.ustreas.gov

⁴ Risk-free rate (Rt) for 30 Year Treasury bond rate from the U.S. Treasury Department at www.ustreas.gov

⁵ Value Line

⁶ Historical Market Risk Premium (Rp) calculated from 2015 Ibbotson SBBI Classic Yearbook data

⁷ Testimony

Sahuarita Water Company, Inc. Cost of Capital Calculation Average Capital Structure of Sample Water Utilities

[A]	[B]	[C]	[D]	
		Common		
Company	<u>Debt</u>	Equity	<u>Total</u>	
American States Water	38.7%	61.3%	100.0%	
California Water	45.9%	54.1%	100.0%	
Aqua America	50.3%	49.7%	100.0%	
Connecticut Water	45.6%	54.4%	100.0%	5
Middlesex Water	44.3%	55.7%	100.0%	
SJW Corp	54.7%	45.3%	100.0%	
York Water	43.4%	<u>56.6%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	
Average Sample Water Utilities	46.1%	53.9%	100.0%	
Sahuarita	20.57%	79.43%	100.0%	

Source:

Sample Water Companies from Value Line

Sahuarita Water Company, Inc. Cost of Capital Calculation Growth in Earnings and Dividends Sample Water Utilities

[A]	[B]	[C]	[D]	[E]
	Dividends	Dividends	17 - maio	T i
	Per Share	Per Share	Earnings Per Share	Earnings Per Share
	2005 to 2014			
		Projected	2005 to 2014	Projected
Company	DPS ¹	DPS ¹	EPS ¹	EPS ¹
American States Water	6.4%	6.7%	11.6%	6.5%
California Water	1.4%	8.3%	5.0%	5.4%
Aqua America	7.8%	9.7%	8.9%	6.6%
Connecticut Water	1.9%	5.2%	5.2%	3.2%
Middlesex Water	1.4%	2.3%	4.5%	3.6%
SJW Corp	3.9%	1.3%	8.5%	NA
York Water	3.9%	<u>6.7%</u>	<u>6.1%</u>	<u>5.3%</u>
Average Sample Water Utilities	3.8%	5.7%	7.1%	5.1%

¹ Value Line

Sahuarita Water Company, Inc. Cost of Capital Calculation Sustainable Growth Sample Water Utilities

[A] [B] [C] [D] [E] [F]

	Retention Growth 2005 to 2014	Retention Growth Projected	Stock Financing Growth	Sustainable Growth 2005 to 2014	Sustainable Growth Projected
Company	<u>br</u>	$\frac{b}{b}$	<u>vs</u>	br + vs	br + vs
American States Water	4.6%	7.0%	1.6%	6.2%	8.5%
California Water	2.9%	3.6%	1.4%	4.3%	5.0%
Aqua America	4.3%	5.7%	1.2%	5.5%	6.9%
Connecticut Water	2.3%	4.1%	3.4%	5.7%	7.5%
Middlesex Water	1.6%	3.6%	2.0%	3.6%	5.6%
SJW Corp	4.0%	4.2%	1.1%	5.0%	5.2%
York Water	<u>2.4%</u>	<u>3.8%</u>	<u>3.0%</u>	<u>5.4%</u>	<u>6.8%</u>
Average Sample Water Utilities	3.1%	4.6%	2.0%	5.1%	6.5%

[B]: Value Line [C]: Value Line

[D]: Value Line, Yahoo Finance, and Form 10-Ks filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (http://www.sec.gov/)

[E]: [B]+[D] [F]: [C]+[D]

Sahuarita Water Company, Inc. Cost of Capital Calculation Selected Financial Data of Sample Water Utilities

Spot Price 3/17/2016 38.72 26.18 32.13	Book Value 13.97 13.48 9.57	Mkt To <u>Book</u> 2.8 1.9	Value Line Beta <u>b</u> 0.70 0.75	Raw Beta <i>braw</i> 0.52 0.60
3/17/2016 38.72 26.18	13.97 13.48	Book 2.8 1.9	Beta <u>b</u> 0.70	Beta <u>braw</u> 0.52
3/17/2016 38.72 26.18	13.97 13.48	Book 2.8 1.9	<u>⊭</u> 0.70	<u>braw</u> 0.52
38.72 26.18	13.97 13.48	2.8 1.9	0.70	0.52
26.18	13.48	1.9		
			0.75	0.60
32.13	9 57	2.4		
	7.51	3.4	0.75	0.60
43.76	21.34	2.1	0.65	0.45
30.74	12.61	2.4	0.75	0.60
36.28	17.26	2.1	0.75	0.60
30.49	8.71	<u>3.5</u>	<u>0.75</u>	0.60
		2.6	0.73	0.57
	30.49	30.49 8.71		

[C]: Msn Money [D]: Value Line [E]: [C] / [D] [F]: Value Line

[G]: (-0.35 + [F]) / 0.67

Sahuarita Water Company, Inc. Cost of Capital Calculation Calculation of Expected Infinite Annual Growth in Dividends Sample Water Utilities

[A]	[B]	
<u>Description</u>	g	
DPS Growth - Historical ¹	3.8%	
DPS Growth - Projected ¹	5.7%	
EPS Growth - Historical ¹	7.1%	
EPS Growth - Projected ¹	5.1%	
Sustainable Growth - Historical ²	5.1%	
Sustainable Growth - Projected ²	<u>6.5%</u>	
Average	5.6%	

1 Schedule CSB-5

2 Schedule CSB-6

Sahuarita Water Company, Inc. Cost of Capital Calculation Multi-Stage DCF Estimates Sample Water Utilities

[A]	[B]	[C]	[D]	[E]	[F]	[G]	[H]
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

C	Current Mkt. Price $(P_a)^1$	Proje		nds ² (Stage 1 g	Stage 2 growth ³	Equity Cost Estimate (K) ⁴	
<u>Company</u>	3/17/2016	$\mathbf{d_1}$	d_2	⊉,) d₃	d_4	18#+	<u> Bounder (1.)</u>
American States Water	38.7	0.90	0.95	1.00	1.06	6.4%	8.7%
California Water	26.2	0.67	0.71	0.75	0.79	6.4%	8.9%
Aqua America	32.1	0.70	0.74	0.78	0.82	6.4%	8.5%
Connecticut Water	43.8	1.08	1.14	1.21	1.27	6.4%	8.8%
Middlesex Water	30.7	0.77	0.81	0.86	0.91	6.4%	8.9%
SJW Corp	36.3	0.78	0.83	0.87	0.92	6.4%	8.5%
York Water	30.5	0.60	0.63	0.67	0.71	6.4%	8.3%

$$P_0 = \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{D_t}{(1+K)^t} + \frac{D_n(1+g_n)}{K-g_n} \left[\frac{1}{(1+K)}\right]^n$$

Average 8.7%

Where: P_0 = current stock price

 D_t = dividends expected during stage 1

K = cost of equity

n = years of non – constant growth D_n = dividend expected in year n

 g_n = constant rate of growth expected after year n

^{1 [}B] see Schedule CSB-7

² Derived from Value Line Information

³ Average annual growth in GDP 1929 - 2012 in current dollars.

⁴ Internal Rate of Return of Projected Dividends

Sahuarita Water Company, Inc. Cost of Capital Calculation								
Capitalization								
	<u>Interest Rate</u>	Annual Interest		Amount outstanding Annual Interest as of 12/31/2014		-	Percentage of Capital Structure	
Long-Term Debt								
WIFA Loan	4.20%	\$	97,693	\$	2,326,035			
Long-Term Debt		\$	97,693	\$	2,326,035	20.57%		
Short-Term Debt		\$	-	·	, ,	0.00%		
Total Debt Common Equity Common Shares Outstanding	4.20%	\$	97,693	\$ \$	2,326,035 8,982,660	20.57%		
Paid in Capital Retained Earnings								
Total Common Equity				\$	8,982,660	79.43%		
Total Capitalization				\$	11,308,695	100.00%		